



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,583	11/26/2003	Edward Krause	RGB-101	7608
20/028	7590	11/24/2008		
Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC				
755 MAIN STREET				
MONROE, CT 06468				
EXAMINER				
O'CONNOR, BRIAN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Interview Summary</p>	Application No. 10/723,583	Applicant(s) KRAUSE ET AL.	
	Examiner BRIAN T. O'CONNOR	Art Unit 2419	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian T. O'Connor (Patent Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) Douglas McAllister (Rgr. # 37,886; for Applicant). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 15 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Meggers, Heddes, and Candalore.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's arguments concerning the contents of Meggers, Heddes, and Candalore as applied to claims 1, 15, and 24 were discussed. The Examiner agreed to re-consider the arguments discussed with respect to claims 1, 15, and 24. No consensus was reached at the conclusion of the interview.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Hassan Kizoul/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419